

## **IGT UNC Modification Workstream Meeting 20-02**

### **Draft Minutes**

**Friday 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020**

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London EC3M 4AJ

<b>Attendee</b>		<b>Organisation</b>	
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	Gemserv	Chair
Brandon Rodrigues*	(BR)	ESP	
Chris Barker	(CB)	BUUK	
Cher Harris*	(CH)	Indigo Pipelines	
Claire Roberts*	(CR)	Scottish Power	
Liam Gallagher	(LG)	BUUK	
Kirsty Dudley*	(KD)	E.ON	
Ellie Rogers*	(ER)	Xoserve	
Kemi Fontaine	(KF)	Gemserv	Secretariat

\*Attendees joined meeting via teleconference

#### **1. Welcome and apologies for absence**

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting. No apologies were received.

#### **2. Confirmation of Agenda**

The Chair confirmed the items for discussion as outlined in the final agenda.

#### **3. Approval of the Previous Minutes**

Attendees considered the minutes from the Modification Workstream meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2020 (20-01). KF confirmed that no comments had been received from the workgroup, however the Chair stated that action (MWS19/10-06) was duplicated on the minutes and would be removed. Subject to this amendment the minutes were approved.

#### **4. Outstanding Actions**

Outstanding actions were reviewed by the workgroup. Please see Appendix 1 for a record of the discussion and new actions.

## 5. Modification Workgroups

### [IGT130 – Applying Password Protection Encryption to Electronic Communication Containing MPRNs](#)

The Chair summarised the pre-drafted Workgroup Report, which highlighted the discussion in previous workgroups as a series of bullet points. The Workgroup Agreed that these were a good start, but that the bullets needed further supporting information.

The workgroup deliberated over which concerns should be expanded or removed from the report. CB stated that the Pipeline Operator's concerns around the efficiency of the modification's approach and whether it is congruent with the existing process, should be broadened. This was challenged by the proposer who explained that the concern was applicable to the Mod in its infancy and as the modification had been amended and is the final version, it no longer applied.

CB indicated that the point regarding the anticipated increase in encryption emails needed to be expanded to provide more clarity in terms of whether the increase would affect all parties. The proposer stated that this had not been a quantified point, and the workgroup agreed that this could be noted on the work group report.

The workgroup agreed that a phased implementation was not appropriate and that the period for implementation of the mod should be a minimum of three months.

The proposer suggested that the point referring to the difficulties Shippers encounter with encrypted invoices could be removed. CH stated that this was an inescapable issue and was concerned that Shippers would struggle with the encryption, although support could be provided to them.

The Chair enquired whether the group was satisfied with the wording under the section 'Relevant Objectives'. CB stated that it should be noted that there would be a time scale of approximately three to six months for implementation. CB explained that this could be applied to everyone, however, was not confident on how deliverable this objective would be for everyone involved.

The Chair asked if there were any comments on the legal text while highlighting the main changes. The work group stated that the legal text met the intent of the change and they had no further comments.

It was agreed that the workgroup report would be completed by the Code Administrator after the meeting and that the report would be circulated to meeting attendees to ensure that all the points had been captured.

**20/02-01: Code Administrator to complete workgroup report and circulate to meeting attendees.**

### [IGT131 – Automatic Updates to Meter Read frequency](#)

The Chair provided an update on the UNC equivalent modification (0692S - Automatic updates to Meter Read Frequency) indicating that the modification had been appealed but that the appeal had been rejected. ER explained that EDF raised a further appeal to the Authority and that this was still underway. Xoserve are aiming for an implementation of November 2020 with a check point for a go / no go decision in May as they are working at risk. No deadline for the appeal decision has been confirmed by the Authority.

It was agreed that the modification should be left on the agenda so the workgroup are aware of the status of the modification until an update is received.

### [IGT132 – Introduction of IGT Credit Code Rules](#)

CB explained he had only made minor changes in the legal text. KD queried why in the body there were no points correlating to the equivalent requirements in the UNC. CB stated that he did not wish

for this to mirror the existing UNC modification (UNC 0713: Amendments to TPD V3.1.7 Independent Assessment table) or the UNC legal text. KD asked why the proposer had chosen to adopt the Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) approach for this modification instead of pointing directly to the legal text in the UNC. CB explained that when developing this modification, he reviewed both methods, taking the best of the electricity and gas drafting, however felt that they wanted to use the DCUSA text predominantly, as this was what they (as an independent network owner) were more familiar with and that it followed the same principles. BR indicated that the DCUSA drafting was deemed to be cleaner. KD indicated that this may not be understood by new users and that it would be cleaner and simpler if the text pointed at the UNC.

The tables from the current UNC credit control modification were added into the modification when it was last amended. However, it is not the intention of the proposer that IGT UNC maintains the same rules.

CB referred the workgroup to the analysis in Appendix 1 of the modification which compares the UNC and DCUSA drafting.

**20/02-02: CB to prepare to discuss the analysis in Appendix 1, IGT132 at the next meeting.**

**20/02-3: All were asked to review the legal drafting and provide comments to CB, for discussion at the next Workgroup.**

#### [IGT133 – Transition of IGT Theft Reporting into the IGT UNC](#)

CB the proposer for IGT133 reviewed the legal text and stated that he was happy to move forward with the workgroup report.

The Chair explained to the workgroup members that in SPAA, IGTs would be required to collect data on theft instances, and that this modification requires Pipeline Operators to be ready to produce a report on these instances when requested by the Authority. This is unlike the requirements on the main gas transporters anticipated in the UNC.

The Chair also explained that the IGT modification is ahead of the similar UNC modification (0704S Transporter Theft of Gas Reporting), but the legal text in the IGT points at the UNC Annex 7 for the specification of the theft report content.

**20/02-04: Code administrator to draft a workgroup report for IGT133.**

#### [IGT134 – Introducing ‘Research Body’ as a New User Type to the Data Matrix and IGT UNC](#)

ER updated the workgroup on the current position of the equivalent UNC modification (0702S Introducing ‘Research Body’ as a new User type to the Data Permissions Matrix and UNC TPD Section V5). She stated that the modification had been amended and that the IGT modification would be amended to keep the modifications in line. The UNC modification will be going to the UNC Distribution Workgroup for further discussion.

#### [IGT135 – Alignment of the IGT UNC Part K and the Data Permissions Matrix.](#)

ER stated that the Workgroup were getting close to understanding what UNC Section V5 would look like and that the UNC modification (0697S - Alignment of the UNC TPD Section V5 and the Data Permissions Matrix) had been amended. The IGT UNC equivalent would be amended to keep the modifications in line.

The Chair queried whether this would be the final alteration to this modification before implementation and ER responded that if the amended modification was correct then the next stage would be legal drafting.

[IGT136 – Introducing ‘Performance Assurance Framework Administrator’ as a New User Type to the Data Permissions Matrix.](#)

ER stated that the workgroup report for UNC modification (0649S - Update to UNC to formalise the Data Permissions Matrix) the equivalent to IGT136 was to be going to the UNC Panel next week. The legal text was thought to be uncomplicated and would be provided when the modification goes out to consultation.

**20/02-05: Code administrator to draft the final workgroup report for IGT136 for the next workgroup meeting.**

## **6. Review Groups**

[RG005 – IGT UNC Review of Consequential Changes Resulting from Faster Switching Arrangement](#)

The Chair stated that the UNC Panel had received a letter from Ofgem requesting the legal text for the faster switching SCR and the retail code consolidation SCR and that the Panel had submitted a plan to Ofgem indicating how this would be achieved.

The plan has a dependency on the provision of the legal text for UNC 0708 Re-ordering of the UNC in advance of Faster Switching as this will provide the baseline legal text on which the SCR legal text will be overlaid.

UNC 0708 will reorder the UNC without changing any intent of the code to the same order prescribed in the legal drafting provided for the Faster Switching Significant Code Review (SCR) last year. The reordering will take place later in the spring 2020 when this modification is implemented. An IGT modification is being raised by BR to ensure that the IGT UNC references from the UNC remain current and accurate and it is intended that the two modifications are implemented on the same date to maintain the integrity of the IGT UNC.

So, although the benefits of the reordering were identified through the SCR drafting the modification reordering the UNC is not necessary for the SCR drafting, Ofgem recognise that the legal text for UNC 0708 can act as the baseline for the drafting of both SCRs and that this could reduce the complexity and risk of the implementation., so a dependency on this drafting has been acknowledged.

The review group expressed that they would need to consider and assess the work done for the SCR as part of the plan moving forward. The Chair explained that the drafting of what the review group would do only refers to elements under the governance of the IGT UNC. Also the review group did not include the work needed for UNC0708 and the enabling IGT UNC modification, although the review group had to be cognisant of the plan submitted and agreed by the Panel and work to the timelines to which the Panel have committed.

Work group members enquired about the amount of work still outstanding and whether some or all of it would be available for the next Workgroup meeting. KD felt that the review group should incorporate the work required for UNC 0708 and that this modification was part of and needed for the SCR. The Chair explained that the mod is not needed for the SCR and that Ofgem expected the legal drafting for the SCRs to be delivered and that this is not contingent on the modification being delivered. KD stated that the IGT UNC enabling mod would need to be discussed alongside the review group in order to ensure there would be no confusion around it.

CB requested clarity on work strand 2 and whether it referred to the drafting of the Retail Energy Code (REC) or the SCR drafting. KD believed that the drafting of RG005 is confusing and the Chair asked the workgroup members whether specification within RG005 met their needs and if not, could parties please provide comments. KD suggested that it may need to be simplified as she didn't understand the text.

**20/02-06 All to provide comments on the drafting to identify where greater clarity would be helpful.**

**20/02-07: Code administrator to review the drafting of RG005 and look to improve the ease of understanding of the requirements under the review group.**

## **7. IGT UNC Known issues register**

The Code administrator indicated that Association of Independent Gas Transporters (AIGT) has been subsumed into the Independent Network Association (INA). The AIGT is referenced in the IGT UNC, so it will need to be updated in the Code through a housekeeping change. This will be added to the issues log.

It was also noted that the REC tab in the issues log will be useful for the work being undertaken for the Significant Code Reviews (SCRs).

## **8. IGT UNC Pipeline User Engagement Survey**

The Code administrator presented the result of the IGT UNC User Engagement Survey and the work group members discussed possible solution to encourage more engagement. It was noted that there are indications that meetings may predominantly be held by teleconference supported by web screen facilities in the future.

The workgroup discussed the merits of different ways to engage with parties that might overcome the issues that prevent parties from engaging. It was suggested a workshop day to inform those who may not feel that are knowledgeable enough to attend the meetings. It was suggested that it might be beneficial to create a self-service information page in the form of a webinar, podcast or newsletters.

KD indicated that even with the solutions being suggested that it was unlikely to generate more support. CB suggested that splitting the meeting into segments on points of interest could possibly encourage more participation.

**20/02-08: CA to collate a discussion paper on possible ways to engage with parties for the Modification Panel.**

## **9.Password Reminder**

The Ancillary Document - Password Protection Protocol requires that passwords are changed in March and this serves to remind Parties of this.

## **10. Cross-code Modification Implications**

Four new modifications have been raised in the UNC and have been added to the table.

BR has been monitoring the progress of UNC 0710 CDSP provision of Class 1 read service and will be raising an appropriate IGT modification when required.

## **11. AOB**

BR stated that the MPRN's ranges available for the IGTs are getting low and queried how the governance and process deals with this scenario.

**20/02-09: Code administrator to look into the governance and process for adding to the MPRN ranges and provide feedback to the IGTs**

There were no further items raised for discussion, and the Chair closed the meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2020.

## Appendix 1

Action Reference	Date	Action	Owner	Status
MWS 20/02-01	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	Code Administrator to complete workgroup report and circulate to meeting attendees.	CA	New
MWS 20/02-02	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	CB to prepare to discuss the analysis in Appendix 1, IGT132 at the next meeting.	CB	New
MWS 20/02-03	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	All were asked to review the legal drafting and provide comments to CB, for discussion at the next Workgroup.	All	New
MWS 20/02-04	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	Code administrator to draft a workgroup report for IGT133.	CA	New
MWS 20/02-05	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	All to provide comments on the drafting to identify where greater clarity would be helpful.		
MWS 20/02-06	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	Code administrator to draft the final workgroup report for IGT136 for the next workgroup meeting.	CA	New
MWS 20/02-07	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	Code administrator to provide re-drafting of RG005 to improve the text and ensure this would be easier to read.	CA	New
MWS 20/02-08	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	CA to collate a discussion paper on possible ways to engage with parties for the Modification Panel.	CA	New
MWS 20/02-09	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	Code administrator to look into the governance and process for adding to the MPRN ranges and provide feedback to the	CA	New

		IGTs		
MWS19/10-06	1 <sup>st</sup> October 2019	Code Administrator to review the UNC code obligations for Supply Meter Point Isolations in relation to the issue on the Known Issues Register. Action to remain open.	CA	Open
MWS19/11-01	5 <sup>th</sup> November 2019	Code Administrator to draft a workgroup report for the IGT130 for the December 2019 IGT UNC workstream meeting.	CA	Closed
MWS20/01-01	9 <sup>th</sup> January 2020	Code Administrator to provide ER with the Pipeline User Engagement Survey to be sent to CDSP's distribution list.	CA	Closed
MWS20/01-02	9 <sup>th</sup> January 2020	Code Administrator to provide the legal drafting for IGT130 for the next workgroup meeting.	CA	Closed
MWS20/01-03	9 <sup>th</sup> January 2020	Code Administrator to send a note to Shippers to indicate that a line by line review of the legal text would be conducted at the next workgroup to encourage participation and attendance at the next Workgroup.	All	Closed
MWS20/01-04	9 <sup>th</sup> January 2020	All members to send any comments on IGT132 to the Proposer before the meeting to allow time for review and solutions to be brought back to the next Workgroup. <b>No comments were received by the Proposer</b>	CA	Closed
MWS20/01-05	9 <sup>th</sup> January 2020	Code Administrator to update work strand 2 to cover Portfolio, PSA, PSB, Backing Data and GT1. within the drafting for review group RG005. <b>Drafting amended.</b>	CA	Closed
MWS20/01-06	9 <sup>th</sup> January 2020	Code Administrator to send out placeholders for an additional meeting each month. <b>SCR planning indicated that additional meeting are not required at</b>	CA	Closed



		this time.		
--	--	------------	--	--